5th November 1935]

Mr. V. T. Arasu:—" Am I to take it that the Government are not prepared to consider any such question of colonization of the unemployed on these lands?"

The Hon. Mr. C. A. Souter:—" Notice, Sir."

Alleged circular of the Board of Revenue for reclassification of lands in South Kanara every year.

* 447 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt: Will the Hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the Revenue Board has issued circulars to the Revenue officials in the district of South Kanara to reclassify lands every year in case any lands are converted into garden or wet; and to tax single-crop lands when a second crop is raised on the higher basis?

A.—The Government have no information whether the Board of Revenue has issued any circulars on the point. The attention of the hon. Member is however invited to paragraph 40 and paragraph 12 of the Resettlement Notification appended to G.O. No. 42, Revenue, dated the 5th January 1935, which was laid on the table of the Legislative Council.

Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt:—" May I know whether the Hon. Member will call for a report from the Board of Revenue whether they have issued any order?"

The Hon. Mr. C. A. Souter:—" I have no objection, Sir."

Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt:—" May I ask if it is a cardinal principle of the ryotwari system that when once the classification of the land is settled, it should not be disturbed for another thirty years?"

The Hon. Mr. C. A. Souter:—" As a general statement, it may be true, but there are exceptions."

Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt:—" May I know, Sir, whether the making of improvements and converting the lands from ordinary into garden lands or wet lands or from single crop wet lands into double crop wet lands, come under the exception?"

The Hon. Mr. C. A. Souter:—" Notice, Sir."

Arrest and imprisonment of pattadars in South Kanara for default in the payment of land revenue.

* 448 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt: Will the Hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the Revenue officials in South Kanara are having recourse to arrest and imprisonment of pattadars for enforcing collections of arrears of land revenue; and

(*b*) whether there have been instances when pattadars were arrested and imprisoned to enforce payment of land revenue in other districts of this Presidency within the last ten years; if so, how many, where and when?

[5th November 1935

A.—(*a*) The Government have seen an account published in the 'Hindu', dated 21st October 1935, of the arrest and release of a defaulter in the South Kanara district and have received a memorandum on the subject from the hon. Member. They have called for a report from the Collector.

(*b*) The Government have not the information.

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—" May I know, Sir, whether, in view of the serious distress in the sub-taluks of Hosdrug, the Hon. Member will consider the question of reclassifying the lands on which pepper is grown and bringing them into line with the classification obtaining in the neighbouring district of Malabar? "

The Hon. Mr. C. A. SOUTER:—" Does that question arise out of question No. 448, Sir? "

The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—" Yes, by indirect implication."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" May I know what the position of the Government is with regard to this, especially after the sympathetic assurances given by the Hon. Member on the floor of the House in reply to the adjournment motion? Has the enquiry been made?

The Hon. Mr. C. A. SOUTER:—" The Government have received no further information yet."

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—" May I ask if the Government propose to delete the provision from the Statute? "

The Hon. Mr. C. A. SOUTER:—" I think, Sir, the hon. Member will get the answer if he will read my speech on the adjournment motion."

Collection of enhanced water-rate in the Cauvery-irrigated area of the Namakkal taluk without previous notice.

11-15 a.m. * 449 *Q*.—Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER: Will the Hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the Government without previous individual notice to the ryots collected the enhanced water-rate in the Cauvery-irrigated area of Namakkal taluk of Salem district by coercive process in fasli 1344;

(*b*) if so, how the Government justify their course of action;

(*c*) what the actual amount is of water-rate collections in fasli 1343 and in fasli 1344 (separately) in each of the following, viz., Selur estate, Kunnathur Agraharam, Bommalapalaiyam Agraharam of Namakkal taluk;

(*d*) what the percentage of increase is;

(*e*) whether there has been any precedent to enhance the water-rate at that percentage;

(*f*) whether the Government consulted the Law officers or ascertained public opinion as to the propriety, legality or expediency of enhancing the water-rate at this unusual percentage;